



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/384,541	08/27/1999	DAVID D. TAIEB	52817.00110	7979

29315 7590 04/10/2002

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
ONE FOUNTAIN SQUARE
11911 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/384,541

Applicant(s)

TAIEB, DAVID D.

Examiner

Alan Rahimi

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objection

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph 1.a of the claim incorrectly refers to "liked list" instead of "linked list". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 2 is objected to because the term "universal code" does not appear in the specification. Instead specification on page 2 refers to "universal character set" which Unicode is considered to be. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenschein (U.S. patent 5,500,931) in view of Bamford et al. (U.S. patent 5,506,940).

Regarding claim 1, Sonnenschein teaches a method of selecting a font to output a message to a printer, comprising the steps of:

(a) evaluating the characters of the message to build a linked list of available system fonts matching the characters (column 6, lines 30-33); and

(b) interrogating font tag information to determine a set of supported output types (column 5, lines 12-18). However he does not explicitly suggest printing the message by traversing the linked list of available system fonts. Although Sonnenschein teaches creation of the list but he fails to mention outputting the matched fonts to a printer. Bamford et al. teaches in column 7, lines 19-30 that matched fonts are sent to a printer. Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 2622

obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine Bamford et al. teaching with Sonnenschein's invention to create an out put of the document.

Regarding claim 3, Sonnenschein teaches a method wherein the step of comparing each character comprises the step of testing the ability of each of the set of available system fonts to express that character (column 6, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 5, Bamford et al. teaches a method of claim 1, further comprising the step of (d) generating a code page output corresponding to characters matched to the available system fonts (column 7, lines 5-19).

Claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenschein (U.S. patent 5,500,931) in view of Bamford et al. (U.S. patent 5,506,940) and further in view of Chan et al. (U.S. patent 6,073,147).

Regarding claim 2, Sonnenschein does not teach a method of claim 1, wherein the evaluating of step (a) comprises the step of comparing each character of the message in a universal code to a set of available system fonts (Figure 3 and column 4, lines 30-45). Chan et al. teaches application of Unicode as a universal character code. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art to utilize a universal code for standardizing character recognition in multilingual application.

Regarding claim 4, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

Regarding claims 6, 11 and 16, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Regarding claims 7, 12 and 17, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

Regarding claims 8, 13 and 18, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 3, are applicable.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claims 9, 14 and 19, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.

Regarding claims 10, 15 and 20, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

Other Prior Art Cited

3. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cordell et al. (U.S. patent 5,893,915) teaches font matching.


Kaul et al. (U.S. patent 6,323,864) teaches Unicode Character Code.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 703-306-3473. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.


Alan Rahimi
March 29, 2002


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600